



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,222	12/09/2003	Richard Golasky	016295.1506	4594
23640 7590 10/06/2008 BAKER BOTTS, LLP 910 LOUISIANA HOUSTON, TX 77002-4995				
EXAMINER NGUYEN, TOAN D				
ART UNIT 2616		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 10/06/2008		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

debbie.allen@bakerbotts.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/731,222

Applicant(s)

GOLASKY ET AL.

Examiner

TOAN D. NGUYEN

Art Unit

2616

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/25/08.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 25-28 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19, 29 and 30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 20-24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 October 0903 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
4. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 12-18 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reynolds et al. (US 6,965,934) in view of Reynolds et al. (US 6,848,007).

For claims 1 and 15-18, Reynolds et al. discloses encapsulation protocol for linking storage area networks over a packet-based network, the method comprising:

issuing an original command from one of a plurality of hosts (figure, references 110, 112), the original command is encoded in a first protocol (col. 8, lines 40-44);
receiving the original command by a protocol converting module (col. 8, lines 40-44).

However, Reynolds et al. do not expressly disclose:

determining an address of the one of the plurality of hosts that issued the original command;

converting the first protocol to a second protocol, wherein the original command is encoded in the second protocol;

adding an identifier to the original command encoded in the second protocol to make a revised command, the identifier associating the one of the plurality of hosts that issued the original command; and

sending the revised command to a target device.

In an analogous art, Reynolds et al. (US 6,848,007) disclose:

determining an address of the one of the plurality of hosts that issued the original command (col. 7, lines 23-35);

converting the first protocol to a second protocol, wherein the original command is encoded in the second protocol (col. 7, lines 23-35);

adding an identifier to the original command encoded in the second protocol to make a revised command, the identifier associating the one of the plurality of hosts that issued the original command (col. 7, lines 23-35); and

sending the revised command to a target device (col. 7, lines 58-67).

Reynolds et al. (US 6,848,007) disclose wherein the fibre channel to SCSI appliance includes a module for determining the address of the host (col. 7, lines 23-35 as set forth in claim 15); wherein the iSCSI to SCSI appliance includes a module for determining the address of the host (col. 7, lines 23-35 as set forth in claim 16); wherein the target device includes a module for identifying the address of the host (col. 7, lines 58-67 as set forth in claim 17); and wherein determining the address of the one of the plurality of hosts that issued the original command includes decoding a fibre channel frame to obtain the fibre channel port identification address, the fibre channel frame including the original command and the fibre channel identification address of the host that issued the original command (col. 7, lines 24-35 as set forth in claim 18).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the determining an address of the one of the plurality of hosts that issued the original command, and would have applied Reynolds et al.'s host initiator generic identifier (US 6,848,007) in Reynolds et al.'s host's command. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use Reynolds et al.'s system for mapping addresses of SCSI devices between plurality of SANs that can dynamically map SCSI device addresses across a SAN extender in Reynolds et al.'s encapsulation protocol for linking storage area networks over a packet-based network with the motivation being used by hosts on the local SAN to address the target devices (col. 7, lines 59-61).

For claim 2, Reynolds et al disclose comprising converting the revised command to the original command (col. 5, lines 21-27).

For claim 3, Reynolds et al disclose wherein the original command includes a fibre channel command (col. 8, lines 40-41).

For claim 5, Reynolds et al disclose wherein the revised command includes a SCSI command (col. 8, lines 40-41).

For claim 6, Reynolds et al disclose wherein the physical layer includes a SCSI target device (col. 4, lines 32-34).

For claim 7, Reynolds et al disclose wherein the host includes a fibre channel host (col. 4, lines 6-7).

For claim 12, Reynolds et al disclose wherein the second protocol includes a SCSI protocol (col. 4, lines 36-45).

For claim 13, Reynolds et al disclose wherein the protocol converting module includes a fibre channel to SCSI appliance (col. 4, lines 36-45).

For claim 14, Reynolds et al disclose wherein the protocol converting module includes a fibre channel to iSCSI-SCSI appliance (col. 4, lines 36-45).

wherein determining the address of the one of the plurality of hosts that issued the original command includes decoding a fibre channel frame to obtain the fibre channel port identification address, the fibre channel frame including the original command and the fibre channel identification address of the host that issued the original command (as set forth in claim 18).

For claim 29, Reynolds et al. discloses encapsulation protocol for linking storage area networks over a packet-based network, the method comprising:

a plurality of hosts operably connected to a switch, one of the plurality of hosts

(figure, references 110, 112) issuing an original command in a first protocol (col. 8, lines 40-44);

an appliance for converting the first protocol into a second protocol, the second protocol encoding the original command (col. 8, lines 40-44).

However, Reynolds et al. do not expressly disclose:

the appliance including a module for encoding the address of the host that issued the original command, the encoding module adding an identifier to the command in the second protocol to make a revised command, the identifier associating the one of the plurality of hosts that issued the first command; and

a target device responsive to the command in the second protocol, the target device including a module for converting the revised command to the original command.

In an analogous art, Reynolds et al. (US 6,848,007) disclose:

the appliance including a module for encoding the address of the host that issued the original command, the encoding module adding an identifier to the command in the second protocol to make a revised command, the identifier associating the one of the plurality of hosts that issued the first command (col. 7, lines 23-35); and

a target device responsive to the command in the second protocol, the target device including a module for converting the revised command to the original command (col. 7, lines 58-67).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the the appliance including a module for encoding the address of the host that issued the original command, the encoding module adding an identifier to the command in the second protocol to make a

revised command, the identifier associating the one of the plurality of hosts that issued the first command, and would have applied Reynolds et al.'s host initiator generic identifier (US 6,848,007) in Reynolds et al.'s host's command. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use Reynolds et al.'s system for mapping addresses of SCSI devices between plurality of SANs that can dynamically map SCSI device addresses across a SAN extender in Reynolds et al.'s encapsulation protocol for linking storage area networks over a packet-based network with the motivation being used by hosts on the local SAN to address the target devices (col. 7, lines 59-61).

For claim 30, Reynolds et al. discloses encapsulation protocol for linking storage area networks over a packet-based network, the method comprising:

issuing an original command from one of a plurality of hosts (figure, references 110, 112), the original command is encoded in a first protocol (col. 8, lines 40-44);

receiving the original command by a protocol converting module (col. 8, lines 40-44).

However, Reynolds et al. do not expressly disclose:

determining an address of the one of the plurality of hosts that issued the original command;

converting the first protocol to a second protocol, wherein the original command is encoded in the second protocol;

add an identifier to the original command encoded in the second protocol to make a revised command, the identifier associating the one of the plurality of hosts that issued the original command; and

sending the revised command to a target device.

In an analogous art, Reynolds et al. (US 6,848,007) disclose:

determining an address of the one of the plurality of hosts that issued the original command (col. 7, lines 23-35);

converting the first protocol to a second protocol, wherein the original command is encoded in the second protocol (col. 7, lines 23-35);

add an identifier to the original command encoded in the second protocol to make a revised command, the identifier associating the one of the plurality of hosts that issued the original command (col. 7, lines 23-35); and

sending the revised command to a target device (col. 7, lines 58-67).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the determining an address of the one of the plurality of hosts that issued the original command, and would have applied Reynolds et al.'s host initiator generic identifier (US 6,848,007) in Reynolds et al.'s host's command. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use Reynolds et al.'s system for mapping addresses of SCSI devices between plurality of SANs that can dynamically map SCSI device addresses across a SAN extender in Reynolds et al.'s encapsulation protocol for linking storage area networks over a packet-based network with the motivation being used by hosts on the local SAN to address the target devices (col. 7, lines 59-61).

5. Claims 4, 8-11 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reynolds et al. (US 6,965,934) in view of Reynolds et al. (US 6,848,007) further in view of Yao et al. (US 2003/0084219).

For claims 4, 8-11 and 19, Reynolds et al. in view of Reynolds et al. (US 6,848,007) do not expressly disclose wherein the original command includes an iSCSI command. In an analogous art, Yao et al. disclose wherein the original command includes an iSCSI command (page 2, paragraph [0025], lines 4-13).

Yao et al. disclose further wherein the host includes an iSCSI host (figure 10, reference 240, page 5, paragraph [0047], line 8 as set forth in claim 8), wherein the first protocol includes a fibre channel protocol, and wherein the address of the host includes a port identification address (figure 10, reference 255, page 5, paragraph [0047] as set forth in claim 9), wherein the first protocol includes an Internet protocol, and wherein the address of the host includes an index, the index associating an Internet protocol address or iSCSI node name (figure 13, page 6, paragraph [0057], lines 10-15 as set forth in claim 10), wherein the first protocol includes an iSCSI protocol (figure 10, reference 240, page 5, paragraph [0047] as set forth in claim 11), wherein determining the address of one of the plurality of hosts that issued the original command includes decoding an iSCSI protocol data unit to obtain an IP address and an iSCSI node name, the iSCSI protocol data unit including the original command, the IP address of the host that issued the original command, and the iSCSI node name of the host that issued the original command (page 4, paragraph [0044] as set forth in claim 19).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the wherein the original command

includes an iSCSI command, and would have applied Yao et al.'s Fibre channel in Reynolds et al.'s host's command. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use Yao et al.'s system, apparatus and method for address forwarding for a computer network in Reynolds et al.'s encapsulation protocol for linking storage area networks over a packet-based network with the motivation being disclosed addresses and commands between various protocol that may be used by network devices (page 2, paragraph [0025]).

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 20-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
7. Claims 25-28 are allowed.

Regarding claim 25, the prior art fails to teach a combination of the steps of:

modifying the control field of the original SCSI command encoded in the SCSI protocol to include an identifier to make a revised SCSI command, the identifier associating the one of the plurality of hosts that issued the original SCSI command encoded in the fibre channel protocol, in the specific combination as recited in the claim.

Regarding claim 26, the prior art fails to teach a combination of the steps of:

encoding the port address of the host that issued the original command in the control field of the original SCSI command encoded in the SCSI protocol to make a revised SCSI command having a revised control field, in the specific combination as recited in the claim.

Regarding claim 27, the prior art fails to teach a combination of the steps of:
modifying the control field of the original SCSI command encoded in the SCSI protocol to include an identifier to make a revised SCSI command, the identifier associating the one of the plurality of hosts that issued the original SCSI command encoded in the iSCSI protocol, in the specific combination as recited in the claim.

Regarding claim 28, the prior art fails to teach a combination of the steps of:
encoding the IP index value of the host that issued the original command in the control field of the original SCSI command encoded in the SCSI protocol to make a revised SCSI command having a revised control field, in the specific combination as recited in the claim.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TOAN D. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)272-3153. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:00AM-4:30PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Firmin Backer can be reached on 571-272-6703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/T. D. N./
Examiner, Art Unit 2616

/FIRMIN BACKER/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2616